

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Soil water-holding capacity mediates hydraulic and hormonal signals of near-isohydric and near-anisohydric Vitis cultivars in potted grapevines**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/144185> since

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1071/FP13263

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

**Soil water-holding capacity mediates hydraulic and hormonal signals of near-isohydric and near-anisohydric *Vitis* cultivars in potted grapevines.**

**Abridged title:** Soil and genotype influence on grapevine response to drought.

Sara Tramontini<sup>a,b</sup>, Johanna Döring<sup>c</sup>, Marco Vitali<sup>b</sup>, Alessandra Ferrandino<sup>b</sup>, Manfred Stoll<sup>c</sup>, Claudio Lovisolo<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), Plant Health Unit (PLH), via Carlo Magno 1/a, 43126 Parma, Italy. The positions and opinions presented in this article are those of the author alone and are not intended to represent the views or scientific works of EFSA.

<sup>b</sup> University of Turin, Department of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences, DISAFA, via Leonardo da Vinci 44, 10095 Grugliasco, Italy

<sup>c</sup> Hochschule Geisenheim University (HGU), Department of General and Organic Viticulture, Von-Lade Str. 1, D-65366, Germany

**Summary Text for the Table of Contents.**

The ecophysiological behaviour of grapevine cultivars in response to drought is influenced by the soil conditions and by the plant genotype. These two components interact through a complex of hydraulic and hormonal signal exchanges occurring between roots and leaves. Our work highlights the differences in these signals observed in a near-isohydric and a near-anisohydric grapevine cultivars on two soil substrates with different textures, causing different dynamics of water deprivation during an imposed increasing water stress.

**Abstract**

Grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.) expresses different responses to water stress, not only depending from genotype, but also from the influence of vineyard growing conditions or seasonality. We aimed to analyze the effects on drought response of two grapevine cultivars growing on two soils, one water draining (WD) containing sand 80% vol. and the other water retaining (WR), with no sand. Under these two different water-holding capacities Syrah, displaying a near-anisohydric response to water stress, and Cabernet

Sauvignon (on the contrary, near-isohydric) were submitted to water stress in a pot trial. Xylem embolism contributed to plant adaptation to soil water deprivation: in both cultivars during late phases of water stress, however, in Syrah, already at moderate early stress levels. By contrast, Syrah showed a less effective stomatal control of drought than Cabernet Sauvignon. The abscisic acid (ABA) influenced tightly the stomatal conductance of Cabernet Sauvignon on both pot soils. In the near-anisohydric variety Syrah an ABA-related stomatal closure was induced in WR soil to maintain high levels of water potential, showing that a soil-related hormonal root-to-shoot signal causing stomatal closure superimposes on the putatively variety-induced anisohydric response to water stress.

**Key words:** abscisic acid (ABA), cavitation, embolism, hydraulic conductance, water potential.

## Introduction

Grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.) is a species expressing both isohydric and anisohydric behaviours, not only depending from genotype (Schultz 2003), but also from the influence of growing conditions or seasonality (Chaves *et al.* 2010, de Souza *et al.* 2003) or from the environmental conditions to which the plant was exposed (Collins *et al.* 2010; Lovisolo *et al.* 2010; Pou *et al.* 2012; Tramontini *et al.* 2013a).

Although the genotype itself is not sufficient to preview the physiological behaviour of grapevine plants, some cultivars have been more frequently observed expressing consistent results than others. One of these is Syrah. This cultivar, of mesic origin, has been mainly categorized as anisohydric, either from observations of plants under field conditions (Schultz 2003; Rogiers *et al.* 2009; Soar *et al.* 2009) or in pots (Soar *et al.* 2006). Cabernet Sauvignon, on the other hand, has been more frequently observed to display a response to water deprivation nearer to isohydric type (Hochberg *et al.* 2013). Owing to the differential response observed on these two cultivars under the same water conditions, Cabernet Sauvignon and Syrah have already been coupled in comparative experiments (Chalmers 2007; Petrie and Sadras 2008; Rogiers *et al.* 2009; Hochberg *et al.* 2013) and can therefore be selected as efficient models for representing iso- and anisohydric behaviours.

The stomatal control, which is an endogenous, but highly variable character, was considered in combination with the soil effect. Soil is in fact another crucial component in grape and wine production, not only because it determines the water and nutrients availability for the plant and therefore its productive performances, but also for its specific implication in the “*terroir* effect” in viticulture (Bodin and Morlat 2006; van Leeuwen *et al.* 2009). In spite of the acknowledged importance on grape and wine production, not many studies attempted to quantify its effects with comparative trials. For this reason, in the presented work, we decided to focus the attention only on the differences produced by two soils in terms of soil texture and related water availability provided to the plant: one single aspect which is, however, strongly influenced by physical, chemical, and biological properties of the substrate. When a soil dries, in fact, the increasing drought affects the plant in multiple and complex ways (Whitmore and Whalley 2009).

Cavitation of the xylem vessels is a very relevant consequence of the limited soil moisture, as it can produce dramatic consequences by reducing the hydraulic conductivity of the vascular tissues and impairing the possibility for the plant to replace transpired water (Brodersen *et al.* 2013). It is also one of the most studied effects of drought in grapevine, in combination with loss in hydraulic conductance (Lovisolo and Tramontini 2010). In leaves, cavitation and consequent embolism formation affect mainly the leaf midrib (Blackman *et al.* 2010), with a conductivity loss in grapevine petioles of 50% at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  of -0.95 MPa and of more than 90% at -1.5MPa (Zufferey *et al.* 2011). On the other hand, the entity of damage produced by cavitation and the break against its propagation are modulated by the speed and intensity of stomata reaction and by its effect on transpiration (Domec and Johnson 2012) approximating leaves to hydraulic fuses of the plant (Zufferey *et al.* 2011).

Embolism formation and repair is controlled by a likely hydraulic mediation at the leaf level (Pantin *et al.* 2013) and via chemical signals (Salleo *et al.* 1996; Lovisolo and Schubert 2006) among which abscisic acid (ABA) has a crucial role. ABA is in fact the hormone devoted to drive the stomatal response to drought: when the soil water potential declines, ABA acts as a messenger indicating water stress from the roots, via the xylem sap, to the guard cells in the leaves and inducing the stomata closure (Hartung *et al.* 2002), limiting in such a way the potential consequences of embolism

formation (Chitarra *et al.* 2014). When the water availability is recovered to an adequate level, the roots stop releasing the hormone and the stomata re-open. The delayed interruption of the signal, much more gradual than the initial release, suggests a further action of the hormone on the embolisms repair (Lovisolo *et al.* 2008; Perrone *et al.* 2012).

Furthermore, in grapevine metabolic and hydraulic behaviour have shown to be related, according to the observations recently published by Hochberg *et al.* (2013) from a study conducted on Cabernet Sauvignon and Syrah plants too. In this work the more anisohydric grapevine cultivar showed higher water uptake and higher  $g_s$  than the near-isohydric cultivar.

The aim of the present work is to analyze the effect of two types of drying soil, differing in water retaining properties, on two grapevines genotypes, characterized by different ecophysiological behaviour, from the point of view of the hydraulic balance of the plant (i.e. water potential, stomatal control, embolism formation), and its hormonal (ABA) control of water losses.

## Materials and Methods

### *Plant material and growing conditions*

The trial was conducted in August 2012 at Hochschule Geisenheim University (Geisenheim, Germany) on 16 three-year-old plants of *Vitis vinifera* L. of two genotypes: 8 plants of ‘Cabernet Sauvignon’ and 8 of ‘Syrah’. Both were grafted on hybrids of *Vitis berlandieri* × *Vitis riparia* (‘161-49 Couderc’ for ‘Cabernet Sauvignon’ and ‘420A Millardet Et De Grasset’ for ‘Syrah’) of comparable characteristics (Whiting 2004), especially in controlling the interrelationship between leaf or stem water potential and stomatal conductance (Tramontini *et al.* 2013b). The plants were maintained under glasshouse conditions with no supplementary light or heating in 9 L (24 cm average diameter) plastic pots filled (20 cm depth) with two different substrates, one water draining (WD soil) and the other water retaining (WR soil). The WD substrate was composed of 80 % vol. of sand and 20 % vol. of ED 73 (Einheitserde Classic, Einheitserde-Einheitserde- und Humuswerke Gebr. Patzer GmbH & Co.KG, Sinntal, Germany; consisting of 55% white peat, 30% clay, 15% sod peat; chemical

properties pH ( $\text{CaCl}_2$ ) 5.8, salt content  $2.5 \text{ g L}^{-1}$ ) including nutrient salt (14+16+18,  $1 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ ) and a slow-release fertilizer (Gepac LZD 20+10+15,  $2 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ ), the WR substrate consisted entirely of ED 73.

Plants were watered to container capacity at the beginning of the experiment (Tramontini *et al.* 2013b) and fertilized in order to bring them to the same level of nitrogen availability. Soil nitrogen content after the fertilization was estimated according to Robinson recommendations (1988), confirming that at the beginning of the experiment the two different substrates had approximately the same amount of available nitrogen. Data collection started when the plants had reached a mild water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}} \leq -0.5 \text{ MPa}$ ), such as four days after interruption of irrigation. In that moment plants had  $14.4 \pm 2.8$  leaves with no significant differences between cultivars or soils. Each plant was excluded from the trial when wilting was observed.

Soil water content ( $\theta$ , %), soil water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ , MPa), stem water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , MPa), xylem embolism extent and stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) were assessed during the whole duration of the experiment. All measurements were taken daily between 9:30-12:00 and 14:00-17:00 in order to standardize putative control of circadian expression in cell water channels (Uehlein and Kaldenhoff 2006).

#### *Water relations*

Soil water content ( $\theta$ ) was gravimetrically determined by collecting daily approximately 10 ml of soil from three different points and depths in each pot (5, 10, 15 cm depth at the half of rays  $120^\circ$  distant one from the other). The soil was weighed, oven-dried at  $100^\circ \text{C}$  for 24 h and then re-weighed to assess water content. At the same time, the water retention curves for the two soils were assessed with pressure plate measurements of the potting substrate (Richards 1965), obtaining two equations:

$$\text{WR soil} \quad -\Psi_{\text{soil}} = 53.791 * e^{-0.127 * \theta}$$

$$\text{WD soil} \quad -\Psi_{\text{soil}} = 1.3423 * e^{-0.264 * \theta}$$

The obtained relationships allowed for the calculation of  $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$  based on  $\theta$ .

$\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  was measured on mature, undamaged and non-senescent leaves using a pressure chamber (Soilmoisture Corp., Santa Barbara, CA, USA) (Scholander *et al.* 1965) at midday according to Turner (1988). Prior to the measurements leaves were bagged with a plastic sheet and covered with aluminium foil to stop transpiration at least 1 h before measurements were taken.

### *Xylem embolism*

Daily determination of xylem embolisms in leaf petioles, induced by the presence of air bubbles in xylem vessels, was carried out around midday using a high-pressure flowmeter (HPFM, Dynamax Inc., Houston, TX, USA) (Tyree *et al.* 1995). As the assessment of embolism extent is a destructive analysis, leaf petioles were used as a proxy of the plant behaviour (Lovisolo *et al.* 2008; Perrone *et al.* 2012). During the whole duration of the experiment macro- and microbubbles were regularly flushed out of the system according to the manufacturer's instruction manual and the mismatch between the two pressure transducers was controlled daily by running the 'Set Zero' routine before measuring.

For each determination of percent loss of conductivity (PLC), the petioles and leaves were cut under water from the shoots and immediately attached to the HPFM tubing under water preventing air bubbles to enter the system. The leaves were cut ~1 cm above the petiole insertion a few seconds after starting the measurement. The initial hydraulic conductance  $K_{\text{hi}}$  was determined applying an initial pressure of ~20 kPa for 3 min. Distilled and degassed water with an addition of 10 mmol L<sup>-1</sup> KCl was used as perfusion liquid. Petioles were then flushed for 3 min applying a transient increase of pressure until a pressure of ~550 kPa was reached. This pressure was kept constant for 3 min. To determine the final hydraulic conductance  $K_{\text{hf}}$  the pressure was downregulated to ~20 kPa and held constant for 3 min. To calculate  $K_{\text{hi}}$  and  $K_{\text{hf}}$  average values of the hydraulic conductance of the respective timespans were used.

Data were displayed and stored using the software HPFM95-XP Version 1.12 (Dynamax Inc.) and exported and processed using Microsoft Excel.

The percent loss of conductivity (PLC) was determined as follows:

$$\text{PLC [\%]} = \frac{(K_{\text{hf}} - K_{\text{hi}})}{K_{\text{hf}}} * 100$$

After the embolism determination the length and the maximum and minimum diameter of the petioles was assessed.

#### *Stomatal conductance*

Measurements of  $g_s$  were carried out on adult, non-senescent leaves that were well-exposed to direct sunlight.  $G_s$  was measured using a porometer (AP4, Delta-T Devices Ltd, Cambridge, UK). Measurements on three leaves per plant were taken for every measuring cycle and the  $g_s$  values of the three leaves were averaged.

#### *Analysis of abscisic acid (ABA) in leaves*

ABA was extracted from leaves where stomatal conductance was assessed applying the method described by Materán *et al.* (2009) with some adaptations: 2 g of frozen tissue were grounded to powder under liquid nitrogen, 5 ml of 80 % Methanol were added and the samples were extracted at 4 °C overnight. Samples were centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 5 min, the supernatant was transferred to a flask and methanol was evaporated. The pH was adjusted to values between 8-9 with a phosphate buffer; 1 ml of ethyl acetate was added and samples were centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 5 min; after discarding the supernatant, the pH was adjusted to 2-3 (with 1N HCl), 2 ml of ethyl acetate were added and the samples were centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 5 min. The supernatant was removed and the ethyl acetate fraction was evaporated. The dry residue was re-suspended in methanol, filtered in brown vials and injected into a 1260 Infinity HPLC-DAD System (Agilent Technologies, Cernusco sul Naviglio, Milano, Italy). ABA was separated on a Purosphere® STAR RP-18, 5 µm, LiChroCART (250-4) (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) column thermostated at 35 °C. The solvent gradient used was 100 % A (94.9 % H<sub>2</sub>O: 5 % CH<sub>3</sub>CN: 0.1 % HCOOH) to 100 % B (5 % H<sub>2</sub>O: 94.9 % CH<sub>3</sub>CN: 0.1 % HCOOH) over 20 min. Solvent B was held at 100 % for 10 min then the solvent returned to 100 % A (Forcat *et al.* 2008). The flow rate into the column was set at 0.5 ml/min. DAD detection was performed at 262 nm, acquiring spectra in the range 190/700 nm.



To quantify ABA concentration in leaf samples the external standard method was used by building a calibration curve with ( $\pm$ )- Absciscic acid,  $\geq 98.5\%$  (Sigma Aldrich SRL, Milan, Italy) concentration ranging from 13.5 to 54.0 mg L<sup>-1</sup>; ABA identification was performed on the basis of retention times and of DAD spectrum comparison respect to the standard solution.

### *Statistical analysis*

Regression coefficients were obtained using Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA), and statistical analysis was performed with univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to reveal differences among cultivars and soils, by using IBM SPSS statistics 20.0 software package (SPSS, Chicago, IL). Differences between means were revealed by Tukey test ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## **Results**

### *Interrelationships between stomatal conductance and soil and stem water potential in different soils and cultivars*

Our observations excluded the initial phase of optimal water availability and focused on the dynamics of water relations evolving from mild (day 1 of measurements) to extreme drought, as shown in Fig. 1. The soil water content between WR and WD soils was very different from the beginning, however, the dynamics of the daily averages of  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  and  $g_s$  did not express constant differences between soils and cultivars along the period of the trial. The proportion of embolized vessels at petiole level (PLC) was higher on WD soil than on WR for most of the trial, but not constantly along the trial.

In spite of that, the relationship between  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  and  $\theta$  highlights how the two substrates are distinct for their effect on plant water status (Fig. 2). These differences are already evident at mild water stress conditions ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  around -0.5 MPa) and while on WR soil the two cultivars show a linear relationship with  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  decreasing with decreasing  $\theta$  (expressed as small, negative slope of regression lines), on WD the  $\theta$  is so reduced that

$\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  changes substantially for any small variation of  $\theta$  (expressed as higher, negative slope of regression lines).

The measured  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  was then combined with the calculated soil water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ ) (Fig. 3). The obtained curves show that during water stress  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  declined following a decrease in  $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ . In Cabernet Sauvignon this plant adaptation was evident at mild stress conditions, and apparently delayed (and/or less effective) in Syrah.

The response of  $g_s$  to  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  was maximum at the beginning of the trial with an overlap of the two curves representing the two cultivars at around -1.4 MPa (Fig. 4a). In comparison to Syrah Cabernet Sauvignon showed lower  $g_s$  under mild water stress conditions without strong changes under severe water stress conditions characterising its isohydric behaviour. Our experiment focuses on results obtained under stress, but hypothetical relationships preceding limiting conditions can be drafted: in these conditions Cabernet Sauvignon would probably have shown a steep adaptation to water stress, while Syrah progressively coupled stomatal function with decreasing plant water status (Fig. 4a). When splitting the two curves for the soil plots, further observations can be collected (Fig. 4b). The two cultivars on WD soil maximize their differences, whereas on WR soil they become minimized. Syrah maintains generally higher  $g_s$  values than Cabernet Sauvignon, but, while, at a given  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , in Syrah  $g_s$  is higher on WD than on WR soil, the opposite happens in Cabernet Sauvignon.

When these results are presented in form of average values, as illustrated in Fig. 5, all these differences in  $g_s$  of the two cultivars appear significantly valid at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  not lower than -1 MPa, whereas no significant differences between  $g_s$  of the different cultivars occur at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  lower than -1 MPa.

By sorting all measurements of stomatal conductance and stem water potential in three homogenous groups according to decreasing levels of soil water potential, it is possible to run a statistical analysis of results collected at comparable level of soil water availability (Table 1). At highest levels of soil water potential (mild water stress) the cultivar and not the soil significantly drives stomatal conductance, buffering stem water potential adjustments. When water availability in soil further decreases (intermediate water stress) soil properties significantly influence stomatal response. In such

conditions, in WR soils a stomatal closure is induced to maintain high levels of stem water potential. In Cabernet Sauvignon the putative isohydric control on water potential is not so effective, as in parallel to a not significant stomatal closure, plants respond to water deprivation with a decrease in water potential. Under severe water stress, however, stomatal control does not avoid decrease on water potential. At these severe levels of water deprivation, soil properties do not influence  $g_s/\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  response.

#### *Embolism-related and hormone-driven plant adaptations to water stress*

While observations concerning  $g_s$  are relevant for level of stress not higher than -1MPa, the level of embolism quantified as percent loss of hydraulic conductivity (PLC) provides relevant results also at more extreme conditions (Fig. 6). The differences observed between the two soils are statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) with the vines on WD substrates showing a significantly higher PLC compared to WR substrates at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} < -1$  MPa.

The analysis of the ABA content in leaves showed that the relationship between ABA concentration and  $g_s$  was consistently dependent on soil type for Syrah but not for Cabernet Sauvignon (Fig. 7a), variety where stomatal control was tighter (Fig. 7b). In both varieties, significantly in Syrah, the WR soil induces an increase of ABA content in leaf (Fig. 7b).

## **Discussion**

The aim of this study was to investigate how soil water-holding capacity could influence hydraulic and hormone-driven reactions of two cultivars putatively recognised as different in their stomatal response to water stress: Cabernet Sauvignon and Syrah.

#### *Hydraulic control of water stress*

Water stress effects were already apparent at mild water stress conditions ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  around -0.5 MPa), when plants started to experience different shrinking capacities of the two substrates. According to Whitmore and Whalley (2009), in fact, when a shrinking soil dries, as WR substrate of our pots, its degree of saturation is kept small in comparison with a drying rigid soil, such as the WD soil of this experiment (Fig. 1). In WD soils,

the matric potential becomes negative much faster, lowering the level of saturation after a much smaller amount of water is removed by roots

In addition to the soil effect, with  $\Delta\Psi$  between soil and stem higher for Cabernet Sauvignon than for Syrah, the two cultivars expressed a different capacity of water extraction from the substrate (Fig. 3), requiring to the former a higher energy in order to keep the water flow under increasing stress conditions. Furthermore, and probably related to the above-mentioned reason, Syrah displays higher  $g_s$  values than Cabernet Sauvignon, especially during early phases of water stress (mild water stress) (Fig. 4). On the other hand, Cabernet Sauvignon would preserve soil moisture more efficiently than Syrah, imposing at the same time a sensitive control to  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  while  $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$  decreases (Fig. 3). This result is consistent with putative near-anisohydric behaviour for Syrah and near-isohydric behaviour for Cabernet Sauvignon and with results recently obtained in an experiment by Hochberg *et al.* (2013). Also a lower leaf area of the canopy could preserve soil moisture, but our pot plants have been uniformed to have not different leaf area. The curves obtained from the four combinations soil/cultivar (Fig. 4b) could be thus explained by the fact that in water-stress conditions near-anisohydric varieties do not promptly regulate their stomatal conductance and therefore their transpiration rate (which was the case of WD substrate, Fig. 2). On the contrary, near-isohydric varieties, by tightly regulating the stomatal aperture, limit more the waste of water resources. Furthermore, it can be observed how the two curves on WR substrate are closer between each other than to the respective cultivar-correspondent on WD. As already observed under field conditions (Tramontini *et al.* 2013a), the expression of plant reactions to water stress seems to be buffered on clay soils. This could be due to the higher capacity of this kind of soils to hold water and release it gradually to the plant. It could be hypothesized that WR substrate produces an effect similar to that of clay soil, submitting the potted roots to transient drought conditions (produced by the daily fluctuations of dehydration during the day and rehydration during the night) able to interfere with the physical and hormonal signalling between roots and stem. However, as illustrated in Fig. 5, all these differences in  $g_s$  are significantly valid at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  not lower than -1 MPa. When water stress becomes more severe, stomatal regulation is hydraulically controlled and a feedback on stomatal function derives from the metabolic plant control. Under increasing water stress, the limitations to photosynthesis pass

gradually from a stomatal control to a metabolic control (Flexas *et al.* 2004 and 2006). Due to this, the differences between iso- and anisohydric behaviours are evident between mild and moderate water stress, where the expression of the limitations imposed at stomatal level are maximised. In our results, at these conditions, the average  $g_s$  is significantly different between varieties but not between substrates (under each variety), although on WD the differences remain evident. Concerning the consequent risk of cavitation, Syrah on both soils and Cabernet Sauvignon on WD have an increase in embolism formation, expressed in terms of xylem conductivity losses, of 32–36%, moving from  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} > -1$  MPa to  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} < -1$  MPa. Only Cabernet Sauvignon on WR soil shows higher embolism formation at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} > -1$  MPa than at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} < -1$  MPa. An explanation of this phenomenon would require the support of further data concerning, for example, the implication of the chemical signalling (in particular ABA) in the transpiration control. Soar *et al.* (2006) have in fact demonstrated the contribution of ABA to the differential response of  $g_s$  in iso- and anisohydric cultivars.

#### *Abscisic-acid control on stomatal conductance*

On the near-isohydric cultivar, Cabernet Sauvignon, expressing very similar level of cavitation on the two soils at  $\Psi_{\text{stem}} > -1$  MPa, we could observe a more stable ABA signal, independently from the soil (Fig. 7), similarly to observations by Puértolas *et al.* (2013) using *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. In contrast, in Syrah, showing two levels of cavitation on the two soils both at moderate and at higher stress level, also the curves of ABA concentration in leaves were clearly distinguished, between the leaves of plants on WR soil richer on the hormone than those on WD soil, showing a substrate-dependant ABA concentration, as observed by Dodd *et al.* (2010) on *Helianthus annuus* L. In order to analyze better this result we suggest comparing it with that on Fig. 4b: contrary to initial expectations, Syrah has generally higher  $g_s$  on WD than on WR soil, and this may be due to the specific circumstances produced by the WR soil, as above-mentioned, favouring the release of the hormone (ABA) in the leaf. As recently observed by Brodribb and McAdam (2013) on two conifer species, the isohydric stomatal regulation can be identified as an ABA-driven stomatal closure, while the anisohydric is at least initially water potential-driven. The same appears to be true on our two grapevine cultivars: ABA control on  $g_s$  is tight in Cabernet Sauvignon and it is independent to soil properties. In Syrah plants potted on WD soil a similar ABA control on stomatal

conductance subsists. However, when the anisohydric Syrah grows onto the WR soil, an additional ABA leaf biosynthesis or accumulation is recordable. The WR-induced raise in ABA allows stomatal control limiting the anisohydric response, as it happens when anisohydric grapevines are deficit-irrigated upon partial root zone drying (Stoll *et al.* 2000; Romero *et al.* 2012).

#### *Hints for future research and speculations*

Our results are in line with those recently presented by Hochberg *et al.* (2013) on a similar work done on the same two varieties and with the general consideration on the differential photoprotective response to stress in iso- and anisohydric cultivars (Pou *et al.* 2012). We would expect that plant productivity of Cabernet Sauvignon, due to the ABA-driven stomatal closure and its putatively stronger downregulation of photosynthesis, is less influenced by the soil characteristics than Syrah.

The results of our current study combined with the ecological and oenological characteristics of the two genotypes, seem to find coherence: Cabernet Sauvignon, the more isohydric variety, thanks to a tight stomatal control, conserves varietal characteristics on the grape independently from the growing conditions. From a viticultural point of view, the avoidance of extreme conditions (and of the consequent recovery phases) to which Syrah is more prone, allows this variety to buffer vintage differences. Hence, the more anisohydric variety, seems to base its stomatal control more on hydraulic signals. This could be hypothesized as the effect of a higher involvement of long term adaptation mechanisms, such as anatomic modifications, and the development of a product which strongly varies according to the characteristics of the substrate. Both are expressions of the *terroir* concept favouring different components and mechanisms to adapt.

Although our results have been obtained on potted plants, where the nature of the substrate and the available volume for root development are a limiting projection of the edaphic condition of a vineyard, nevertheless they could be of support in the interpretation of *terroir* expression previously introduced by the same authors (Tramontini *et al.* 2013a). The isohydric Cabernet Sauvignon can adapt to a variety of climates and soils and, in spite of that, maintain certain organoleptic traits in the final

product. It is considered extremely capable to express the characteristics of a given *terroir* and, due to that, has been for a long time the world's most widely planted premium red wine grape (Robinson 2006). The anisohydric Syrah, on the other hand, is a very common commercial variety (the world's 7<sup>th</sup> most grown grape in 2004, still according to Robinson 2006) particularly distributed in warmer regions, from which very diverse wines can be produced.

Furthermore, ABA plays a key role by stimulating the activation of the anthocyanin and flavonoids biosynthesis pathway (Davies and Böttcher 2009; Ferrandino and Lovisolo 2014). Both, its impact on water relations and on berry metabolism may contribute to a differential berry quality. This hypothesis could represent a relevant topic for further studies in field conditions, where also long terms mechanisms of adaptation and more complex dynamics of hormonal signalling (Dodd 2013) can be observed, and extended to other varieties, considering the main mechanisms involved in the *terroir* expression.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, we reported a hydraulic control of stomatal responses at the base of the near-anisohydric Syrah adaptations to water stress, in contrast to an ABA-induced stomatal control in the near-isohydric Cabernet Sauvignon. Also is Syrah, however, the hormone-related response could be effective when soil properties allowed for higher water storage buffering hydraulic adaptations.

## References

- Blackman CJ, Brodribb TJ, Jordan GJ (2010) Leaf hydraulic vulnerability is related to conduit dimensions and drought resistance across a diverse range of woody angiosperms. *New Phytologist* **188**, 1113–1123.
- Bodin F, Morlat R (2006) Characterization of viticultural *terroirs* using a simple field model based on soil depth I. Validation of the water supply regime, phenology and vine vigour, in the Anjou vineyard (France). *Plant and Soil* **281**, 37–54.

- 411 Brodersen CR, McElrone AJ, Choat B, Lee EF, Shackel KA, Matthews MA (2013) *In*  
 412 *vivo* visualizations of drought-induced embolism spread in *Vitis vinifera*. *Plant*  
 413 *Physiology* **161**, 1820–1829.
- 414 Brodribb TJ, McAdam SAM (2013) Abscissic acid mediates a divergence in the drought  
 415 response of two conifers. *Plant Physiology* **162**, 1370–1377.
- 416 Chalmers YM (2007) Influence of sustained deficit irrigation on physiology and  
 417 phenolic compounds in winegrapes and wine. PhD Thesis, School of Agriculture and  
 418 Wine, Discipline of Wine and Horticulture, The University of Adelaide, Australia, 180  
 419 pp. <http://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/2440/50101/1/02whole.pdf>
- 420 Chaves MM, Zarrouk O, Francisco R, Costa JM, Santos T, Regalado AP, Rodrigues  
 421 ML, Lopes CM (2010) Grapevine under deficit irrigation: hints from physiological and  
 422 molecular data. *Annals of Botany* **105**, 661–676.
- 423 Chitarra W, Balestrini R, Vitali M, Pagliarani C, Perrone I, Schubert A, Lovisolo C  
 424 (2014) Gene expression in vessel-associated cells upon xylem embolism repair in *Vitis*  
 425 *vinifera* L. petioles. *Planta*, in press. Doi: 10.1007/s00425-013-2017-7
- 426 Collins MJ, Fuentes S, Barlow EWR (2010) Partial rootzone drying and deficit  
 427 irrigation increase stomatal sensitivity to vapour pressure deficit in anisohydric  
 428 grapevines. *Functional Plant Biology* **37**, 128–138.
- 429 Cruz de Carvalho MH (2008) Drought stress and reactive oxygen species production,  
 430 scavenging and signalling. *Plant Signal Behaviour* **3**, 156–165.
- 431 Davies C, Böttcher C (2009) Hormonal control of grape berry ripening. In: Grapevine  
 432 molecular physiology and biotechnology. Eds. K. Roubelakis-Angelakis (Springer  
 433 Netherlands), 229–261.
- 434 de Souza CR, Maroco JP, dos Santos TP, Rodrigues ML, Lopes CM, Pereira JS, Chaves  
 435 M (2003) Partial rootzone drying: regulation of stomatal aperture and carbon  
 436 assimilation in field-grown grapevines (*Vitis vinifera* cv. Moscatel). *Functional Plant*  
 437 *Biology* **30**, 653–662.



- 438 Dodd IC (2013) Absciscic acid and stomatal closure: a hydraulic conductance  
439 conundrum? *New Phytologist* **197**, 6–8.
- 440 Dodd IC, Egea G, Watts C, Whalley WR (2010) Root water potential integrates discrete  
441 soil physical properties to influence ABA signalling during partial rootzone drying.  
442 *Journal of Experimental Botany* **61**, 3543–3551.
- 443 Domec J-C, Johnson DM (2012) Does homeostasis or disturbance of homeostasis in  
444 minimum leaf water potential explain the isohydric versus anisohydric behavior of *Vitis*  
445 *vinifera* L. cultivars? *Tree Physiology* **32**, 245–248.
- 446 Ferrandino A, Lovisolo C (2014) Abiotic stress effects on grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.):  
447 focus on absciscic acid-mediated consequences on secondary metabolism and berry  
448 quality. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, in press. Doi:  
449 10.1016/j.envexpbot.2013.10.012
- 450 Flexas J, Bota J, Cifre J, Escalona JM, Galmés J, Gulias J, Lefi EK, Martinez-Cañellas  
451 SF, Moreno MT, Ribas-Carbó M, Riera D, Sampol B, Medrano H (2004)  
452 Understanding down-regulation of photosynthesis under water stress: future prospects  
453 and searching for physiological tools for irrigation management. *Annals of Applied*  
454 *Biology* **144**, 273–283.
- 455 Flexas J, Bota J, Galmés J, Medrano H, Ribas-Carbó M (2006) Keeping a positive  
456 carbon balance under adverse conditions: responses of photosynthesis and respiration to  
457 water stress. *Physiologia Plantarum* **127**, 343–352.
- 458 Forcat S, Bennett MH, Mansfield JW, Grant MR (2008) A rapid and robust method for  
459 simultaneously measuring changes in the phytohormones ABA, JA and SA in plants  
460 following biotic and abiotic stress. *Plant Methods* **4**, 16.
- 461 Hartung W, Sauter A, Hose E (2002) Absciscic acid in the xylem: where does it come  
462 from, where does it go to? *Journal of Experimental Botany* **53**, 27–32.
- 463 Hochberg U, Degu A, Fait A, Rachmilevitch S (2013) Near isohydric grapevine cultivar  
464 displays higher photosynthetic efficiency and photorespiration rates under drought

- 465 stress as compared with near anisohydric grapevine cultivar. *Physiologia Plantarum*  
 466 **147**, 443–452.
- 467 Lovisolo C, Schubert A (2006) Mercury hinders recovery of shoot hydraulic  
 468 conductivity during grapevine rehydration: evidence from a whole-plant approach. *New*  
 469 *Phytologist* **172**, 469–478.
- 470 Lovisolo C, Tramontini S (2010) Methods for assessment of hydraulic conductance and  
 471 embolism extent in grapevine organs (Chapter 6). In: Serge Delrot, Hipolito Medrano  
 472 Gil, Etti Or, Luigi Bavaresco, Stella Grando (eds). *Methods and Results in Grapevine*  
 473 *Research*, Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 71–85.
- 474 Lovisolo C, Perrone I, Carra A, Ferrandino A, Flexas J, Medrano H, Schubert A (2010)  
 475 Drought-induced changes in development and function of grapevine (*Vitis* spp.) organs  
 476 and in their hydraulic and non hydraulic interactions at the whole plant level: a  
 477 physiological and molecular update. *Functional Plant Biology* **37**, 98–116.
- 478 Lovisolo C, Perrone I, Hartung W, Schubert A (2008) An abscisic acid-related reduced  
 479 transpiration promotes gradual embolism repair when grapevines are rehydrated after  
 480 drought. *New Phytologist* **180**, 642–651.
- 481 Materán ME, Fernández M, Valenzuela S, Sáez K, Seemann P, Sánchez-Olate M, Ríos  
 482 D (2009) Abscisic acid and 3-indolacetic acid levels during the reinvigoration process  
 483 of *Pinus radiata* D. Don adult material. *Plant Growth Regulation* **59**, 171–177.
- 484 Pantin F, Monnet F, Jannaud D, Costa JM, Renaud J, Muller B, Simonneau T, Genty B  
 485 (2013) The dual effect of abscisic acid on stomata. *New Phytologist* **197**, 65–72.
- 486 Perrone I, Pagliarani C, Lovisolo C, Chitarra W, Roman F, Schubert A (2012) Recovery  
 487 from water stress affects grape leaf petiole transcriptome. *Planta* **235**, 1383–1396.
- 488 Petrie PR, Sadras VO (2008) Advancement of grapevine maturity in Australia between  
 489 1993 and 2006: putative causes, magnitude of trends and viticultural consequences.  
 490 *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research* **14**, 33–45.

- 491 Pou A, Medrano H, Tomàs M, Martorell S, Ribas-Carbó M, Flexas J (2012)  
 492 Anisohydric behaviour in grapevines results in better performance under moderate  
 493 water stress and recovery than isohydric behaviour. *Plant and Soil* **359**, 335–349.
- 494 Puértolas J, Alcobendas R, Alarcón JJ, Dodd IC (2013) Long-distance abscisic acid  
 495 signalling under different vertical soil moisture gradients depends on bulk root water  
 496 potential and average soil water content in the root zone. *Plant, Cell and Environment*  
 497 **36**, 1465–1475.
- 498 Richards LA (1965) Physical condition of water soil. In: Black C.A. eds. Methods of  
 499 soil analysis. Madison, Wisconsin, USA: Am. Soc. Agronomy Inc.
- 500 Robinson JB (1988) Grapevine Nutrition. In ‘Viticulture. Volume 2, Practices’. Eds. B.  
 501 Coombe and P.R. Dry, Winetitles, Adelaide, South Australia. pp. 178–208.
- 502 Robinson J (2006) The Oxford Companion to Wine (Third ed.). (Oxford University  
 503 Press), 119–121.
- 504 Rogiers SY, Greer DH, Hutton RJ, Landsberg JJ (2009) Does night-time transpiration  
 505 contribute to anisohydric behaviour in a *Vitis vinifera* cultivar? *Journal of Experimental*  
 506 *Botany* **60**, 3751–3763.
- 507 Romero P, Dodd IC, Martinez-Cutillas A (2012) Contrasting physiological effects of  
 508 partial root zone drying in field-grown grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L. cv. Monastrell)  
 509 according to total soil water availability. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **63**, 4071–  
 510 4083.
- 511 Salleo S, Lo Gullo MA, Trifilò P, Nardini A (2004) New evidence for a role of vessel-  
 512 associated cells and phloem in the rapid xylem refilling of cavitated stems of *Laurus*  
 513 *nobilis* L. *Plant, Cell and Environment* **27**, 1065–1076.
- 514 Scholander PF, Hammel HT, Bradstreet ED, Hemmingsen EA (1965) Sap pressure in  
 515 vascular plants. *Science* **148**, 339–346.

- 516 Schultz HR (2003) Differences in hydraulic architecture account for near-isohydric and  
 517 anisohydric behaviour of two field-grown *Vitis vinifera* L. cultivars during drought.  
 518 *Plant, Cell and Environment* **26**, 1393–1405.
- 519 Soar CJ, Speirs J, Maffei SM, Penrose AB, McCarthy MG, Loveys BR (2006) Grape  
 520 vine varieties Shiraz and Grenache differ in their stomatal response to VPD: apparent  
 521 links with ABA physiology and gene expression in leaf tissue. *Australian Journal of*  
 522 *Grape and Wine Research* **12**, 2–12.
- 523 Soar CJ, Collins MJ, Sadras VO (2009) Irrigated Shiraz vines (*Vitis vinifera*) upregulate  
 524 gas exchange and maintain berry growth in response to short spells of high maximum  
 525 temperature in the field. *Functional Plant Biology* **36**, 801–814.
- 526 Stoll M, Loveys Br, Dry Pr (2000) Hormonal changes induced by partial rootzone  
 527 drying of irrigated grapevine. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **51**, 1627–1634.
- 528 Tramontini S, van Leeuwen C, Domec J-C, Destrac-Irvine A, Basteau C, Vitali M,  
 529 Mosbach-Schulz O, Lovisolo C (2013a) Impact of soil texture and water availability on  
 530 the hydraulic control of plant and grape-berry development. *Plant and Soil* **368**, 215–  
 531 230.
- 532 Tramontini S, Vitali M, Centioni L, Schubert A, Lovisolo C (2013b) Rootstock control  
 533 of scion response to water stress in grapevine. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*  
 534 **93**, 20–26.
- 535 Turner NC (1988) Measurement of plant water status by the pressure chamber  
 536 technique. *Irrigation Science* **9**, 289–308.
- 537 Tyree MT, Patiño S, Bennink J, Alexander J (1995) Dynamic measurements of root  
 538 hydraulic conductance using a high-pressure flowmeter in the laboratory and field.  
 539 *Journal of Experimental Botany* **46**, 83–94.
- 540 Uehlein N, Kaldenhoff R (2006) Aquaporins and biological rhythm. *Biological Rhythm*  
 541 *Research* **37**, 315–322.

- 542 van Leeuwen C, Tregoat O, Choné X, Bois B, Pernet D, Gaudillère JP (2009) Vine  
543 water status is a key factor in grape ripening and vintage quality for red Bordeaux wine.  
544 How can it be assessed for vineyard management purposes? *Journal International des*  
545 *Sciences de la Vigne et du Vin* **43**, 121–134.
- 546 Whiting JR (2004), Grapevine rootstocks. In: Dry PR and Coombe BG (Eds) *Viticulture*  
547 *Volume 1 – Resources* 2nd Edition. Winetitles, 2004, 167–188.
- 548 Whitmore AP, Whalley WR (2009) Physical effects of soil drying on roots and crop  
549 growth. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **60**, 2845–285.
- 550 Zufferey V, Cochard H, Ameglio T, Spring JL, Viret O (2011) Diurnal cycles of  
551 embolism formation and repair in petioles of grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* cv. Chasselas).  
552 *Journal of Experimental Botany* **62**, 3885–3894.
- 553

## Figure legends

Figure 1. (a) Dynamics of soil moisture ( $\theta$ , %), (b) stem water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , MPa), (c) stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ), and percent loss of (d) conductivity due to embolisms (PLC, %), during the days of the trial. Measurements were conducted on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon (*circles*) and Syrah (*triangles*) on water draining (WD, *white*) and water retaining (WR, *black*) soils. Means  $\pm$  std err. *Diamonds* in frame (d) represent the mean value of the day for both cultivars grouped.

Figure 2. Relationship between stem water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , MPa) and soil moisture ( $\theta$ , %) measured on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon (*circles*) and Syrah (*triangles*) on water draining (WD, *white*) and water retaining (WR, *black*) soils. Arrows on the x axis point to maximum water-holding capacity of the two soils (% water at -0.01 MPa).

Figure 3. Relationship between stem water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , MPa) and soil water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ , MPa) measured on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon (*circles*) and Syrah (*triangles*) on water draining (WD, *white*) and water retaining (WR, *black*) soils.  $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$  was obtained from direct measures while  $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$  from the derived equations of  $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$  and  $\theta$ .

Figure 4. Interrelationship between stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) and stem water potential ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ , MPa) measured on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon (*circles*) and Syrah (*triangles*) on water draining (WD, *white*) and water retaining (WR, *black*) soils. The two figures present the same data clustered only for varieties (a) and for the varieties on each soil (b). In addition, in Fig. 4a, an arbitrary hypothetical curve preceding water stress has been identified with a dashed line.

Figure 5. Average values of leaf stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) measured on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon on water retaining soil (WR, *black*) and on water draining soil (WD, *light grey*) and on Syrah plants on WR (*dark grey*) and on WD (*white*). Data have been clustered for those collected between mild and moderate water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}} > -1$  MPa) and high water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}} < -1$  MPa). Values of bars topped by common letters are not significantly different, while different letters identify significantly different groups ( $P < 0.05$  (\*),  $P < 0.01$  (\*\*); Tukey Test).

Figure 6. Average values of percent loss of conductivity (PLC, %) due to embolism formation, measured on leaf petioles of Cabernet Sauvignon on water retaining soil (WR, *black*) and on water draining soil (WD, *light grey*) and on Syrah plants on WR (*dark grey*) and on WD (*white*). Data have been clustered for those collected between mild and moderate water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}} > -1$  MPa) and high water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}} < -1$  MPa). Values of bars topped by common letters are not significantly different, while different letters identify significantly different groups ( $P < 0.05$  (\*),  $P < 0.01$  (\*\*); Tukey Test).

Figure 7 a and b. Relationship between stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) and abscisic acid (ABA) concentration ( $\text{ng g}^{-1} \text{fw}$ ) in leaf samples on plants of Cabernet Sauvignon (*circles*) and Syrah (*triangles*) on water draining (WD, *white*) and water retaining (WR, *black*) soils. In frame (a), continuous lines represent the two curves obtained for Cabernet Sauvignon and dashed lines for Syrah. In frame (b), means  $\pm$  std errors are displayed.

Water stress		$\Psi_{\text{stem}}$		$g_s$	
Mild ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.083$ )	Cabernet Sauvignon	-0.972	n.s.	36.1	b
	Syrah	-0.764	n.s.	75.2	a
Intermediate ( $-0.083 > \Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.212$ )	Cabernet Sauvignon	-1.189	b	33.4	n.s.
	Syrah	-0.875	a	55.3	n.s.
Severe ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} < -0.212$ )	Cabernet Sauvignon	-1.780	b	14.7	b
	Syrah	-1.087	a	35.2	a
Mild ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.083$ )	water retaining soil (WR)	-0.964	n.s.	41.9	n.s.
	water draining soil (WD)	-0.745	n.s.	60.9	n.s.
Intermediate ( $-0.083 > \Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.212$ )	water retaining soil (WR)	-1.196	n.s.	27.9	b
	water draining soil (WD)	-0.867	n.s.	60.8	a
Severe	water retaining soil (WR)	-0.994	n.s.	19.5	n.s.

( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} < -0.212$ )	<b>water draining soil (WD)</b>	-1.498	n.s.	22.3	n.s.
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------	------	------	------

596

597 Table 1: influence of cultivar and soil water-holding capacity on stem water potential  
598 ( $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ ) and stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ). Data were divided in three classes of soil water  
599 potential ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ ) values: mild ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.083$ ), intermediate ( $-0.083 > \Psi_{\text{soil}} > -0.212$ ) and  
600 severe water stress ( $\Psi_{\text{soil}} < -0.212$ ), and processed separately for the two effects of  
601 cultivar and soil. Different letters indicate significant differences among means,  $F$ -test,  
602  $P < 0.05$ , post hoc Tukey's test.

603















